

THE MASS GAP AND SOLUTION OF THE GLUON CONFINEMENT PROBLEM IN QCD

V. Gogokhia*

HAS, CRIP, RMKI, Depart. Theor. Phys., Budapest 114, P.O.B. 49, H-1525, Hungary

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We propose to realize a mass gap in QCD not imposing the transversality condition on the full gluon self-energy, while preserving the color gauge invariance condition for the full gluon propagator. Since due to color confinement the gluon is not a physical state, none of physical observables/processes in low-energy QCD will be directly affected by such a temporary violation of color gauge invariance/symmetry. In order to make the existence of a mass gap perfectly clear the corresponding subtraction procedure is introduced. All this allows one to establish the general structure of the full gluon propagator in the presence of a mass gap. It is mainly generated by the nonlinear interaction of massless gluon modes. The physical meaning of the mass gap is to be responsible for the large-scale (low-energy/momentum), i.e., nonperturbative structure of the true QCD vacuum. The direct nonlinear iteration solution of the transcendental equation for the full gluon propagator in the presence of a mass gap is present. We formulate a general method how to restore the transversality of the full gluon propagator relevant for the nonperturbative QCD. It is explicitly shown that such a solution confines QCD. The exact and gauge-invariant criterion of gluon confinement is derived. The gauge-invariant quark confinement criterion is also formulated.

PACS numbers: 11.15.Tk, 12.38.Lg

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) [1, 2] is widely accepted as a realistic quantum field gauge theory of strong interactions not only at the fundamental (microscopic) quark-gluon level but at the hadronic (macroscopic) level as well. This means that in principle it should describe the properties of experimentally observed hadrons in terms of experimentally never seen quarks and gluons, i.e., to describe the hadronic world from first principles – an ultimate goal of any fundamental theory. But this is a formidable task because of the color confinement phenomenon, the dynamical mechanism of which is not yet understood, and therefore the confinement problem remains unsolved up to the present days. It prevents colored quarks and gluons to be experimentally detected as physical ("in" and "out" asymptotic) states which are colorless (i.e., color-singlets), by definition, so color confinement is permanent and absolute [1].

Today there is no doubt left that color confinement and other dynamical effects, such as spontaneous breakdown of chiral symmetry, bound-state problems, etc., being essentially nonperturbative (NP) effects, are closely related to the large-scale (low-energy/momentum) structure of the true QCD ground state and vice-versa ([3, 4] and references therein). The perturbation theory (PT) methods in general fail to investigate them. If QCD itself is a confining theory then a characteristic scale has to exist. It should be directly responsible for the above-mentioned structure of the true QCD vacuum in the same way as Λ_{QCD} is responsible for the nontrivial perturbative dynamics there (scale violation, asymptotic freedom (AF) [1]).

However, the Lagrangian of QCD [1, 2] does not contain explicitly any of the mass scale parameters which could have a physical meaning even after the corresponding renormalization program is performed. So the main goal of this paper is to show how the characteristic scale (the mass gap, for simplicity) responsible for the NP dynamics in the infrared (IR) region may explicitly appear in QCD. This becomes an imperative especially after Jaffe and Witten have formulated their theorem "Yang-Mills Existence And Mass Gap" [5]. We will show that the mass gap is dynamically generated mainly due to the nonlinear (NL) interaction of massless gluon modes. In order to realize it our proposal is to temporarily violate the $SU(3)$ color gauge invariance/symmetry of QCD. Since due to color confinement the gluon is not a physical state, none of physical observables/processes in low-energy QCD will be directly affected by this proposal.

As mentioned above, there is no place for the mass gap in the QCD Lagrangian, so the only place when the mass gap may appear is the corresponding system of dynamical equations of motion, the so-called Schwinger-Dyson (SD) equations, which should be complemented by the Slavnov-Taylor (ST) identities ([1] and references therein). The

*gogokhia@rmki.kfki.hu

propagation of gluons is one of the main dynamical effects in the true QCD vacuum. It is described by the above-mentioned corresponding SD quantum equation of motion for the full gluon propagator. The importance of this equation is due to the fact that its solutions reflect the quantum-dynamical structure of the true QCD ground state. The color gauge structure of this equation is also one of the main subjects of our investigation in order to find a way how to realize a mass gap in QCD.

The ultraviolet (UV) asymptotic (when the gluon momentum squared goes to infinity ($q^2 \rightarrow \infty$)) of all the possible solutions of the gluon SD equation is determined by AF (the number of solutions is not fixed, since the equation is highly NL one). At the same time, their IR asymptotic (when the gluon momentum goes to zero ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$)) is, in general, of two types: smooth and singular. Only the solution of the color confinement problem will decide which type of the formal solutions really takes place. It is explicitly shown here that indeed the general iteration solution for the full gluon propagator in the presence of a mass gap after making the necessary subtractions of the PT contributions leads to the confining potential in QCD. It is always IR singular, and thus the gluons remain massless. No approximations/truncations and no special gauge choice for the regularized skeleton loop integrals, contributing to the full gluon self-energy, are made. The derived criterion of gluon confinement is exact and gauge-invariant.

II. QED

It is instructive to begin with a brief explanation why a mass gap does not occur in quantum electrodynamics (QED). The photon SD equation can be symbolically written down as follows:

$$D(q) = D^0(q) + D^0(q)\Pi(q)D(q), \quad (2.1)$$

where we omit, for convenience, the dependence on the Dirac indices, and $D^0(q)$ is the free photon propagator. $\Pi(q)$ describes the electron skeleton loop contribution to the photon self-energy (the so-called vacuum polarization tensor). Analytically it looks

$$\Pi(q) \equiv \Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = -g^2 \int \frac{id^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \text{Tr}[\gamma_\mu S(p-q)\Gamma_\nu(p-q, q)S(p)], \quad (2.2)$$

where $S(p)$ and $\Gamma_\mu(p-q, q)$ represent the full electron propagator and the full electron-photon vertex, respectively. Here and everywhere below the signature is Euclidean, since it implies $q_i \rightarrow 0$ when $q^2 \rightarrow 0$ and vice-versa. This tensor has the dimensions of a mass squared, and therefore it is quadratically divergent. To make the formal existence of a mass gap (the quadratically divergent constant, so having the dimensions of a mass squared) perfectly clear, let us now, for simplicity, subtract its value at zero. One obtains

$$\Pi^s(q) \equiv \Pi_{\mu\nu}^s(q) = \Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) - \Pi_{\mu\nu}(0) = \Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) - \delta_{\mu\nu}\Delta^2(\lambda). \quad (2.3)$$

The explicit dependence on the dimensionless UV regulating parameter λ has been introduced into the mass gap $\Delta^2(\lambda)$, given by the integral (2.2) at $q^2 = 0$, in order to assign a mathematical meaning to it. In this connection a few remarks are in order in advance. The dependence on λ (when it is not shown explicitly) is assumed in all divergent integrals here and below in the case of the gluon self-energy as well (see next section). This means that all the expressions are regularized (including photon/gluon propagator), and we can operate with them as with finite quantities. λ should be removed on the final stage only after performing the corresponding renormalization program (see below). Whether the regulating parameter λ has been introduced in a gauge-invariant way (though this always can be achieved) or not, and how it should be removed is not important for the problem if a mass gap can be "released/liberated" from the corresponding vacuum. We will show in the most general way (not using the PT and no special gauge choice will be made) that this is impossible in QED and might be possible in QCD.

The decomposition of the subtracted vacuum polarization tensor into the independent tensor structures can be written as follows:

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu}^s(q) = T_{\mu\nu}(q)q^2\Pi_1^s(q^2) + q_\mu q_\nu(q)\Pi_2^s(q^2), \quad (2.4)$$

where both invariant functions $\Pi_n^s(q^2)$ at $n = 1, 2$ are, by definition, dimensionless and regular at small q^2 , since $\Pi^s(0) = 0$; otherwise they remain arbitrary. From this relation it follows that $\Pi^s(q) = O(q^2)$, i.e., it is always of the order q^2 . Also, here and everywhere below

$$T_{\mu\nu}(q) = \delta_{\mu\nu} - q_\mu q_\nu / q^2 = \delta_{\mu\nu} - L_{\mu\nu}(q). \quad (2.5)$$

Taking into account the subtraction (2.3), the photon SD equation becomes

$$D(q) = D^0(q) + D^0(q)\Pi^s(q)D(q) + D^0(q)\Delta^2(\lambda)D(q). \quad (2.6)$$

Its subtracted part can be summed up into geometric series, so one has

$$D(q) = \tilde{D}^0(q) + \tilde{D}^0(q)\Delta^2(\lambda)D(q), \quad (2.7)$$

where the modified photon propagator is

$$\tilde{D}^0(q) = \frac{D^0(q)}{1 - \Pi^s(q)D^0(q)} = D^0(q) + D^0(q)\Pi^s(q)D^0(q) - D^0(q)\Pi^s(q)D^0(q)\Pi^s(q)D^0(q) + \dots \quad (2.8)$$

Since $\Pi^s(q) = O(q^2)$ and $D^0(q) \sim (q^2)^{-1}$, the IR singularity of the modified photon propagator is determined by the IR singularity of the free photon propagator, i.e., $\tilde{D}^0(q) = O(D^0(q))$ with respect to the behavior at small photon momentum.

The photon self-energy (2.2) in terms of the independent tensor structures is

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = T_{\mu\nu}(q)q^2\Pi_1(q^2) + q_\mu q_\nu \Pi_2(q^2), \quad (2.9)$$

where again $\Pi_n(q^2)$ at $n = 1, 2$ are dimensionless functions and remain arbitrary. Due to the transversality of the photon self-energy

$$q_\mu \Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = q_\nu \Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

which comes from the current conservation condition in QED, one has $\Pi_2(q^2) = 0$, i.e., it should be purely transversal

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = T_{\mu\nu}(q)q^2\Pi_1(q^2). \quad (2.11)$$

On the other hand, from the subtraction (2.3) and the transversality condition (2.10) it follows that

$$\Pi_2^s(q^2) = -\frac{\Delta^2(\lambda)}{q^2}, \quad (2.12)$$

which, however, is impossible since $\Pi_2^s(q^2)$ is a regular function of q^2 , by definition. So the mass gap should be discarded, i.e., put formally to zero and, consequently, $\Pi_2^s(q^2)$ as well, i.e.,

$$\Delta^2(\lambda) = 0, \quad \Pi_2^s(q^2) = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

Thus the subtracted photon self-energy is also transversal, i.e., satisfies the transversality condition

$$q_\mu \Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = q_\nu \Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

and coincides with the photon self-energy (see Eq. (2.3) at the zero mass gap). Moreover, this means that the photon self-energy does not have a pole in its invariant function $\Pi_1(q^2) = \Pi_1^s(q^2)$. As mentioned above, in obtaining these results neither the PT has been used nor a special gauge has been chosen. So there is no place for quadratically divergent constants in QED, while logarithmic divergence still can be present in the invariant function $\Pi_1(q^2) = \Pi_1^s(q^2)$. It is to be included into the electric charge through the corresponding renormalization program (for these detailed gauge-invariant derivations explicitly done in lower order of the PT see Refs. [2, 6, 7, 8, 9]).

In fact, the current conservation condition (2.10), i.e., the transversality of the photon self-energy lowers the quadratic divergence of the corresponding integral (2.2) to a logarithmic one. That is the reason why in QED only logarithmic divergences survive. Thus in QED there is no mass gap and the relevant photon SD equation is shown in Eq. (2.8), simply identifying the full photon propagator with its modified counterpart. In other words, in QED we can replace $\Pi(q)$ by its subtracted counterpart $\Pi^s(q)$ from the very beginning ($\Pi(q) \rightarrow \Pi^s(q)$), totally discarding the quadratically divergent constant $\Delta^2(\lambda)$ from all the equations and relations. The current conservation condition for the photon self-energy (2.10), i.e., its transversality, and for the full photon propagator $q_\mu q_\nu D_{\mu\nu}(q) = i\xi$ (here and everywhere below ξ is the gauge-fixing parameter) are consequences of gauge invariance. They should be maintained at every stage of the calculations, since the photon is a physical state. In other words, at all stages the current conservation plays a crucial role in extracting physical information from the S -matrix elements in QED, which are usually proportional to the combination $j_1^\mu(q) D_{\mu\nu}(q) j_2^\nu(q)$. The current conservation condition $j_1^\mu(q) q_\mu = j_2^\nu(q) q_\nu = 0$ implies that the unphysical (longitudinal) component of the full photon propagator does not change the physics of QED, i.e., only its physical (transversal) component is important. In its turn this means that the transversality condition imposed on the photon self-energy is also important, because $\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q)$ itself is a correction to the amplitude of the physical process, for example such as electron-electron scattering.

III. QCD

In QCD the gluon is not a physical state due to color confinement. Still, color gauge invariance should also be preserved, so the color current conservation takes place in QCD as well. However, in this theory it plays no role in the extraction of physical information from the S -matrix elements for the corresponding physical processes and quantities. In other words, not the conserved color currents, but only their color-singlet counterparts, which can even be partially conserved, contribute directly to the S -matrix elements describing this or that physical process/quantity. For example, such an important physical QCD parameter as the pion decay constant is given by the following S -matrix element: $\langle 0 | J_{5\mu}^i(0) | \pi^j(q) \rangle = i q_\mu F_\pi \delta^{ij}$, where $J_{5\mu}^i(0)$ is just the axial-vector current, while $|\pi^j(q)\rangle$ describes the pion bound-state amplitude, and i, j are flavor indices.

So in QCD there is no such physical amplitude to which the gluon self-energy may directly contribute (for example, quark-quark/antiquark scattering is not a physical process). The lesson which comes from QED is that if one preserves the transversality of the photon self-energy at every stage, then there is no mass gap. Thus, in order to realize a mass gap in QCD, our proposal is not to impose the transversality condition on the gluon self-energy, but preserving the color gauge invariance condition for the full gluon propagator. As mentioned above, no QCD physics will be directly affected by this. So color gauge symmetry will be violated at the initial stage (at the level of the gluon self-energy) and will be restored at the final stage (at the level of the full gluon propagator, see below).

A. Gluon SD equation

The gluon SD equation can be symbolically written down as follows (for our purposes it is more convenient to consider the SD equation for the full gluon propagator and not for its inverse):

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) + D_{\mu\rho}^0(q) i \Pi_{\rho\sigma}(q; D) D_{\sigma\nu}(q), \quad (3.1)$$

where $D_{\mu\nu}^0(q)$ is the free gluon propagator. $\Pi_{\rho\sigma}(q; D)$ is the gluon self-energy, and in general it depends on the full gluon propagator due to the non-Abelian character of QCD. Thus the gluon SD equation is highly NL, while the photon SD equation (2.1) is a linear one. In what follows we omit the color group indices, since for the gluon propagator (and hence for its self-energy) they are reduced to the trivial δ -function, for example $D_{\mu\nu}^{ab}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}(q) \delta^{ab}$. Also, for convenience, we introduce i into the gluon SD equation (3.1).

The gluon self-energy $\Pi_{\rho\sigma}(q; D)$ is the sum of a few terms, namely

$$\Pi_{\rho\sigma}(q; D) = -\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^q(q) - \Pi_{\rho\sigma}^{gh}(q) + \Pi_{\rho\sigma}^t(D) + \Pi_{(1)\rho\sigma}(q; D) + \Pi_{(2)\rho\sigma}(q; D) + \Pi'_{(2)\rho\sigma}(q; D), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^q(q)$ describes the skeleton loop contribution due to quark degrees of freedom (it is an analog of the vacuum polarization tensor in QED, see Eq. (2.2)), while $\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^{gh}(q)$ describes the skeleton loop contribution due to ghost degrees of freedom. Both skeleton loop integrals do not depend on the full gluon propagator D , so they represent the linear contribution to the gluon self-energy. $\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^t(D)$ represents the so-called constant skeleton tadpole term.

$\Pi_{(1)\rho\sigma}(q; D)$ represents the skeleton loop contribution, which contains the triple gluon vertices only. $\Pi_{(2)\rho\sigma}(q; D)$ and $\Pi'_{(2)\rho\sigma}(q; D)$ describe topologically independent skeleton two-loop contributions, which combine the triple and quartic gluon vertices. The last four terms explicitly contain the full gluon propagators in different powers, that is why they form the NL part of the gluon self-energy. The explicit expressions for the corresponding skeleton loop integrals [10] (in which the corresponding symmetry coefficients can be included) are of no importance here. Let us note that like in QED these skeleton loop integrals are in general quadratically divergent, and therefore they should be regularized (see remarks above and below).

B. A temporary violation of color gauge invariance/symmetry (TVCGI/S)

As we already know from QED, the regularization of the gluon self-energy can be started from the subtraction its value at the zero point (see, however, remarks below). Thus, quite similarly to the subtraction (2.3), in QCD one obtains

$$\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^s(q; D) = \Pi_{\rho\sigma}(q; D) - \Pi_{\rho\sigma}(0; D) = \Pi_{\rho\sigma}(q; D) - \delta_{\rho\sigma}\Delta^2(\lambda; D). \quad (3.3)$$

Let us remind once more that for our purpose, namely to demonstrate a possible existence of a mass gap $\Delta^2(\lambda; D)$ in QCD, it is not important how λ has been introduced and how it should be removed at the final stage. The mass gap itself is mainly generated by the nonlinear interaction of massless gluon modes, slightly corrected by the linear contributions coming from the quark and ghost degrees of freedom, namely

$$\Delta^2(\lambda; D) = \Pi^t(D) + \sum_a \Pi^a(0; D) = \Delta_t^2(D) + \sum_a \Delta_a^2(0; D). \quad (3.4)$$

Here index "a" runs as follows: $a = -q, -gh, 1, 2, 2'$, and $-q, -gh$ mean that both terms enter the above-mentioned sum with minus sign (where, obviously, the tensor indices are omitted). In these relation all the divergent constants $\Pi^t(D)$ and $\Pi^a(0; D)$, having the dimensions of a mass squared, are given by the corresponding skeleton loop integrals at $q^2 = 0$. We can say that we parameterize the sum of all quadratic divergences as the mass gap, and regularize it by λ . **Since we are not going to impose the transversality condition on the full gluon self-energy, these constants summed up into the mass gap squared $\Delta^2(\lambda; D)$ cannot be discarded like in QED, and therefore the mass gap (3.4) should be explicitly taken into account in QCD.** It is worth emphasizing here, that no truncations/approximations and no special gauge choice are made for the regularized skeleton loop integrals, contributing to the full gluon self-energy and hence to the mass gap (3.4).

The general decomposition of the subtracted gluon self-energy into the independent tensor structures can be written in the form

$$\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^s(q; D) = T_{\rho\sigma}(q)q^2\Pi_1^s(q^2; D) + q_\rho q_\sigma \Pi_2^s(q^2; D), \quad (3.5)$$

where both invariant functions $\Pi_1^s(q^2; D)$ and $\Pi_2^s(q^2; D)$ are dimensionless and regular at small q^2 , since, by definition, $\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^s(0; D) = 0$ at any D . Evidently, the subtracted quantities are free of the quadratic divergences, but logarithmic ones can be still present in them like in QED.

C. General structure of the full gluon propagator

Taking into account the subtraction (3.3), the initial gluon SD equation (3.1) becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) + D_{\mu\rho}^0(q)i\Pi_{\rho\sigma}^s(q; D)D_{\sigma\nu}(q) + D_{\mu\sigma}^0(q)i\Delta^2(\lambda; D)D_{\sigma\nu}(q). \quad (3.6)$$

Introducing further the auxiliary free gluon propagator (see Appendix A), the gluon SD equation (3.6), on account of the decomposition (3.5), can be further simplified to

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) - T_{\mu\sigma}(q) \left[\Pi_1^s(q^2; D) + \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^2} \right] D_{\sigma\nu}(q), \quad (3.7)$$

where from now on $D_{\mu\nu}^0(q)$ is the standard free gluon propagator, i.e.,

$$D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) = i \{T_{\mu\nu}(q) + \xi L_{\mu\nu}(q)\} \frac{1}{q^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

The color gauge invariance condition imposed on the full gluon propagator

$$q_\mu q_\nu D_{\mu\nu}(q) = i\xi, \quad (3.9)$$

implies that it should be as follows:

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = i \{T_{\mu\nu}(q)d(q^2) + \xi L_{\mu\nu}(q)\} \frac{1}{q^2}. \quad (3.10)$$

Substituting Eq. (3.10) into the gluon SD equation (3.7), one obtains

$$d(q^2) = \frac{1}{1 + \Pi_1^s(q^2; D) + (\Delta^2(\lambda; D)/q^2)}, \quad (3.11)$$

and it is easy to check that this "solution" satisfies the initial gluon SD equation (3.6), on account of the decomposition (3.5).

The only price we have paid by violating color gauge invariance is the gluon self-energy, while the full and free gluon propagators always satisfy it. Let us emphasize that the expression for the full gluon form factor (3.11) cannot be considered as the formal solution for the full gluon propagator, since both the mass gap $\Delta^2(\lambda; D)$ and the invariant function $\Pi_1^s(q^2; D)$ depend on D themselves. In the formal PT limit $\Delta^2(\lambda; D) = 0$ the gluon self-energy coincides with its subtracted counterpart, see Eq. (3.3), so everything will be like in QED.

In what follows we will replace $\Pi_1^s(q^2; D) \rightarrow \Pi(q^2; D)$, i.e., omitting, for convenience, both superscript "s" and subscript "1".

IV. NONLINEAR ITERATION SOLUTION

In order to perform a formal iteration of the gluon SD equation (3.7), it is much more convenient to address its "solution" for the full gluon form factor (3.11). Let us rewrite it in the form of the corresponding transcendental (i.e., not algebraic) equation, namely

$$d(q^2) = 1 - \left[\Pi(q^2; d) + \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; d)}{q^2} \right] d(q^2) = 1 - P(q^2; d)d(q^2), \quad (4.1)$$

suitable for the formal nonlinear iteration procedure. Here we replace the dependence on D by the equivalent dependence on d . For future purposes, it is convenient to introduce short-hand notations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2(\lambda; d = d^{(0)} + d^{(1)} + d^{(2)} + \dots + d^{(m)} + \dots) &= \Delta_m^2 = \Delta^2 c_m(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2), \\ \Pi(q^2; d = d^{(0)} + d^{(1)} + d^{(2)} + \dots + d^{(m)} + \dots) &= \Pi_m(q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$P_m(q^2) = \left[\Pi_m(q^2) + \frac{\Delta_m^2}{q^2} \right], \quad m = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (4.3)$$

In these relations Δ_m^2 are the auxiliary mass squared parameters, while Δ^2 is the mass gap itself. Via the corresponding subscripts the dimensionless constants c_m depend on which iteration for the gluon form factor d is actually done. They may depend on the dimensionless coupling constant squared g^2 , as well as on the gauge-fixing parameter ξ . We also introduce the explicit dependence on the dimensionless finite (slightly different from zero) subtraction point α ,

since the initial subtraction at the zero point may be dangerous [1]. The dependence of Δ^2 on all these parameters, as well as on the number of different flavors N_f , is not shown explicitly, and if necessary can be restored any time. Let us also remind that all the invariant functions $\Pi_m(q^2)$ are regular at small q^2 . If it were possible to express the full gluon form factor $d(q^2)$ in terms of these quantities then it would be the formal solution for the full gluon propagator. In fact, this is nothing but the skeleton loops expansion, since the regularized skeleton loop integrals, contributing to the gluon self-energy, have to be iterated. This is the so-called general iteration solution. As mentioned above, no truncations/approximations and no special gauge choice have been made. This formal expansion is not a PT series. The magnitude of the coupling constant squared and the dependence of the regularized skeleton loop integrals on it is completely arbitrary.

It is instructive to describe the general iteration procedure in some details. Evidently, $d^{(0)} = 1$, and this corresponds to the approximation of the full gluon propagator by its free counterpart. Doing the first iteration in Eq. (4.1), one thus obtains

$$d(q^2) = 1 - P_0(q^2) + \dots = 1 + d^{(1)}(q^2) + \dots, \quad (4.4)$$

where obviously

$$d^{(1)}(q^2) = -P_0(q^2). \quad (4.5)$$

Doing the second iteration, one gets

$$d(q^2) = 1 - P_1(q^2)[1 + d^{(1)}(q^2)] + \dots = 1 + d^{(1)}(q^2) + d^{(2)}(q^2) + \dots, \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$d^{(2)}(q^2) = -d^{(1)}(q^2) - P_1(q^2)[1 - P_0(q^2)]. \quad (4.7)$$

Doing the third iteration, one further obtains

$$d(q^2) = 1 - P_2(q^2)[1 + d^{(1)}(q^2) + d^{(2)}(q^2)] + \dots = 1 + d^{(1)}(q^2) + d^{(2)}(q^2) + d^{(3)}(q^2) + \dots, \quad (4.8)$$

where

$$d^{(3)}(q^2) = -d^{(1)}(q^2) - d^{(2)}(q^2) - P_2(q^2)[1 - P_1(q^2)(1 - P_0(q^2))], \quad (4.9)$$

and so on for the next iterations.

Thus up to the third iteration, one finally arrives at

$$d(q^2) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d^{(m)}(q^2) = 1 - [\Pi_2(q^2) + \frac{\Delta_2^2}{q^2}] \left[1 - [\Pi_1(q^2) + \frac{\Delta_1^2}{q^2}] [1 - \Pi_0(q^2) - \frac{\Delta_0^2}{q^2}] \right] + \dots. \quad (4.10)$$

We restrict ourselves by the iterated gluon form factor up to the third term, since this already allows to show explicitly some general features of the nonlinear iteration procedure.

A. Splitting/shifting procedure

Doing some tedious algebra, the previous expression can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d(q^2) &= [1 - \Pi_2(q^2) + \Pi_1(q^2)\Pi_2(q^2) - \Pi_0(q^2)\Pi_1(q^2)\Pi_2(q^2) + \dots] \\ &+ \frac{1}{q^2} [\Pi_2(q^2)\Delta_1^2 + \Pi_1(q^2)\Delta_2^2 - \Pi_0(q^2)\Pi_1(q^2)\Delta_2^2 - \Pi_0(q^2)\Pi_2(q^2)\Delta_1^2 - \Pi_1(q^2)\Pi_2(q^2)\Delta_2^2 + \dots] \\ &- \frac{1}{q^4} [\Pi_0(q^2)\Delta_1^2\Delta_2^2 + \Pi_1(q^2)\Delta_0^2\Delta_2^2 + \Pi_2(q^2)\Delta_0^2\Delta_1^2 + \dots] \\ &- \frac{1}{q^2} [\Delta_2^2 - \frac{\Delta_1^2\Delta_2^2}{q^2} + \frac{\Delta_0^2\Delta_1^2\Delta_2^2}{q^4} + \dots], \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

so that this formal expansion contains three different types of terms. The first type are the terms which contain only different combinations of $\Pi_m(q^2)$ (they are not multiplied by inverse powers of q^2); the third type of terms contains only different combinations of (Δ_m^2/q^2) . The second type of terms contains the so-called mixed terms, containing the first and third types of terms in different combinations. The two last types of terms are multiplied by the corresponding powers of $1/q^2$. Evidently, such structure of terms will be present in each iteration term for the full gluon form factor. However, any of the mixed terms can be split exactly into the first and third types of terms by keeping the necessary number of terms in the Taylor expansions in powers of q^2 for $\Pi_m(q^2)$, which are regular functions at small q^2 . Thus the IR structure of the full gluon form factor (which just is our primary goal to establish) is determined not only by the third type of terms. It gains contributions from the mixed terms as well.

Let us present the above-mentioned Taylor expansions as follows:

$$\Pi_m(q^2) = \Pi_m(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)\Pi_m^{(1)}(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)^2\Pi_m^{(2)}(0) + O_m(q^6), \quad (4.12)$$

since for the third iteration we need to use the Taylor expansions maximum up to this order. Here and below μ^2 is some fixed mass squared (not to be confused with the tensor index), as well as $O_m((q^2)^n)$, $n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ denotes the functions which Taylor expansions begin with the term of the order $(q^2)^n$; otherwise they remain arbitrary. For example, for the mixed term $(1/q^2)\Pi_2(q^2)\Delta_1^2$ one has

$$\frac{\Delta_1^2}{q^2}\Pi_2(q^2) = \frac{\Delta_1^2}{q^2}\left[\Pi_2(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)\Pi_2^{(1)}(0) + O_2(q^4)\right] = \frac{\Delta_1^2}{q^2}\Pi_2(0) + a_1\Pi_2^{(1)}(0) + O(q^2). \quad (4.13)$$

Here and everywhere below $a_m = (\Delta_m^2/\mu^2)$, $m = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ are the dimensionless constants. The first term now is to be shifted to the third type of terms and combined with the term $(-1/q^2)\Delta_2^2$, while the second term $a_1\Pi_2^{(1)}(0) + O(q^2)$ is to be shifted to the first type of terms. All other mixed terms of similar structure should be treated absolutely in the same way. For the mixed term $(-1/q^4)\Pi_0(q^2)\Delta_1^2\Delta_2^2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\Delta_1^2\Delta_2^2}{q^4}\Pi_0(q^2) &= -\frac{\Delta_1^2\Delta_2^2}{q^4}\left[\Pi_0(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)\Pi_0^{(1)}(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)^2\Pi_0^{(2)}(0) + O_0(q^6)\right] \\ &= -\frac{\Delta_1^2\Delta_2^2}{q^4}\Pi_0(0) - \frac{\Delta_1^2}{q^2}a_2\Pi_0^{(1)}(0) - a_1a_2\Pi_0^{(2)}(0) - O(q^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Again the first and second terms should be shifted to the third type of terms and combined with terms containing there the same powers of $1/q^2$, while the last two terms should be shifted to the first type of terms.

Similarly to the Taylor expansion (4.12), one has

$$\Pi_m(q^2)\Pi_n(q^2) = \Pi_{mn}(q^2) = \Pi_{mn}(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)\Pi_{mn}^{(1)}(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)^2\Pi_{mn}^{(2)}(0) + O_{mn}(q^6). \quad (4.15)$$

Then, for example the mixed term $(-1/q^2)\Pi_0(q^2)\Pi_1(q^2)\Delta_2^2$ can be split as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\Delta_2^2}{q^2}\Pi_0(q^2)\Pi_1(q^2) &= -\frac{\Delta_2^2}{q^2}\left[\Pi_{01}(0) + (q^2/\mu^2)\Pi_{01}^{(1)}(0) + O_{01}(q^4)\right] \\ &= -\frac{\Delta_2^2}{q^2}\Pi_{01}(0) - a_2\Pi_{01}^{(1)}(0) + O(q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

so again the first term should be shifted to the third type of terms and combined with the terms containing the corresponding powers of $1/q^2$, while other terms are to be shifted to the first type of terms.

Completing this exact splitting/shifting procedure in the expansion (4.11), one can in general represent it as follows:

$$d(q^2) = \left(\frac{\Delta^2}{q^2}\right)B_1(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) + \left(\frac{\Delta^2}{q^2}\right)^2B_2(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) + \left(\frac{\Delta^2}{q^2}\right)^3B_3(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) + f_3(q^2) + \dots, \quad (4.17)$$

where we used notations (4.2), since the coefficients of the above-used Taylor expansions depend in general on the same set of parameters: $\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2$. The invariant function $f_3(q^2)$ is dimensionless and regular at small q^2 ; otherwise it remains arbitrary. The generalization on the next iterations is almost obvious. Let us only note that in this case more terms in the corresponding Taylor expansions should be kept "alive".

B. The exact structure of the general iteration solution

Substituting the generalization of the expansion (4.17) on all iterations and omitting the tedious algebra, the general iteration solution for the regularized full gluon propagator (3.10) can be exactly decomposed as the sum of the two principally different terms as follows:

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) = D_{\mu\nu}^{INP}(q; \Delta^2) + D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q) = iT_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{\Delta^2}{(q^2)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\Delta^2/q^2)^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{k,m}(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) + i \left[T_{\mu\nu}(q) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} A_m(q^2) + \xi L_{\mu\nu}(q) \right] \frac{1}{q^2}, \quad (4.18)$$

where the superscript "INP" stands for the intrinsically NP part of the full gluon propagator. We distinguish between the two terms in Eq. (4.18) by the explicit presence of the mass gap and the character of the corresponding IR singularities (see below). Let us emphasize that the general problem of convergence of the formally regularized series (4.18) is irrelevant here. Anyway, the problem how to remove all types of the UV divergences (overlapping [11] and overall [1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9]) is a standard one. Our problem will be how to deal with severe IR singularities due to their novelty and genuine NP character. Fortunately, there already exists a well-elaborated mathematical formalism for this purpose, namely the distribution theory (DT) [12] into which the dimensional regularization method (DRM) [13] should be correctly implemented (see also Refs. [10, 14]).

As mentioned above, we distinguish between the two terms in the full gluon propagator (4.18) by the explicit presence of the mass gap (when it formally goes to zero then the PT term survives only). This is the first necessary condition. The second equally necessary condition is the nature of the corresponding IR singularities. The INP part of the full gluon propagator is characterized by the presence of severe power-type (or equivalently NP) IR singularities $(q^2)^{-2-k}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$. So these IR singularities are defined as more singular than the power-type IR singularity of the free gluon propagator $(q^2)^{-1}$, which thus can be defined as the PT IR singularity. The INP part depends only on the transversal degrees of freedom of gauge bosons. Though its coefficients $\Phi_{k,m}(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$ may explicitly depend on the gauge-fixing parameter ξ , the structure of this expansion itself does not depend on it. The INP part of the full gluon propagator in Eq. (4.18) is nothing but the corresponding Laurent expansion in integer powers of q^2 accompanied by the corresponding powers of the mass gap squared and multiplied by the sum over the q^2 -independent factors, the so-called residues $\Phi_k(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{k,m}(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$. The sum over m indicates that an infinite number of iterations (all iterations) of the corresponding regularized skeleton loop integrals invokes each severe IR singularity labelled by k . It is worth emphasizing that now this Laurent expansion cannot be summed up into anything similar to the initial Eq. (3.9), since its residues at poles gain additional contributions due to the splitting/shifting procedure, i.e., they become arbitrary. However, this arbitrariness is not a problem, because severe IR singularities should be treated by the DRM correctly implemented into the DT. For this the dependence of the residues on their arguments is all that matters and not their concrete values.

The PT part of the full gluon propagator, which has only the PT IR singularity, remains undetermined. In the PT part the sum over m again indicates that all iterations contribute to the PT gluon form factor $d^{PT}(q^2) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} A_m(q^2)$. What we know about $A_m(q^2)$ functions is only that they are regular functions at small q^2 ; otherwise they remain arbitrary, but $d^{PT}(q^2)$ should satisfy AF at large q^2 . This is the price we have paid to fix exactly the functional dependence of the INP part of the full gluon propagator. Anyway, just this part gives rise to the dominant contributions to the numerical values of physical quantities in low-energy QCD (see discussion below as well).

Both terms in Eq. (4.18) are valid in the whole energy/momentum range, i.e., they are not asymptotics. At the same time, we have achieved the exact separation between the two terms responsible for the NP (dominating in the IR ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$)) and the nontrivial PT (dominating in the UV ($q^2 \rightarrow \infty$)) dynamics in the true QCD vacuum. It is worth emphasizing once more that we exactly distinguish between the two terms in Eq. (4.18) by the character of the corresponding IR singularities. This necessary condition includes the existence of a special regularization expansion for severe (i.e., NP) IR singularities, while for the PT IR singularity it does not exist [10, 12] (see Appendix B as well). Due to the character of the IR singularity the longitudinal component of the full gluon propagator should be included into its PT part, so its INP part becomes automatically transversal. In Refs. [10, 14, 15] we came to the same structure (4.18) but in a rather different way.

Thus the true QCD vacuum is really beset with severe IR singularities. Within the general iteration solution they should be summarized (accumulated) into the full gluon propagator and effectively correctly described by its structure in the deep IR domain, exactly represented by its INP part. The second step is to assign a mathematical meaning to the integrals, where such kind of severe IR singularities will explicitly appear, i.e., to define them correctly in the IR region [10, 15]. Just this violent IR behavior makes QCD as a whole an IR unstable theory, and therefore it may

have no IR stable fixed point, indeed [1], which means that QCD itself might be a confining theory without involving some extra degrees of freedom [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. In section VI below we will show that this is so, indeed.

In summary, the above-mentioned separation between the INP and PT terms in the full gluon propagator (4.18) is not only exact but unique as well. The general iteration solution (4.18) is inevitably severely singular in the IR limit ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$), and this does not depend on the special gauge choice.

C. Remarks on overlapping divergences

The mass gap which appears first in the gluon SD equation (3.6) is the main object we were worried about to demonstrate explicitly its crucial role within our approach. Let us make, however, a few remarks in advance. As it follows from the standard gluon SD equation (3.6), the corresponding equation for the gluon self-energy looks like

$$D^{-1}(q) = D_0^{-1}(q) - q^2 \Pi(q^2; D) - \Delta^2(\lambda; D), \quad (4.19)$$

where we omit, for simplicity, the tensor indices, as well as the longitudinal part of the subtracted gluon self-energy. In order to unravel overlapping UV divergence problems in QCD, the necessary number of the differentiation with respect to the external momentum should be done first (in order to lower divergences). Then the point-like vertices, which are present in the corresponding skeleton loop integrals should be replaced by their full counterparts via the corresponding integral equations. Finally, one obtains the corresponding SD equations which are much more complicated than the standards ones, containing different scattering amplitudes. These skeleton expansions are, however, free from the above-mentioned overlapping divergences. Of course, the real procedure ([11] and references therein) is much more tedious than briefly described above. However, even at this level it is clear that by taking derivatives with respect to the external momentum q in the SD equation for the gluon self-energy (4.19), the main initial information on the mass gap will be totally lost. Whether it will be somehow restored or not at the later stages of the renormalization program is not clear at all. Thus in order to remove overlapping UV divergences ("the water") from the SD equations and skeleton expansions, we are in danger to completely lose the information on the dynamical source of the mass gap ("the baby") within our approach. In order to avoid this danger and to be guaranteed that no dynamical information are lost, we are using the standard gluon SD equation (3.6). The presence of any kind of UV divergences (overlapping and usual (overall)) in the skeleton expansions will not cause any problems in order to detect the mass gap responsible for the IR structure of the true QCD vacuum. In other words, the direct iteration solution of the standard gluon SD equation (3.6) or equivalently (3.7) is reliable to realize a mass gap, and thus to make its existence perfectly clear. The problem of convergence of such regularized skeleton loop series which appear in Eq. (4.18) is completely irrelevant in the context of the present investigation. Anyway, we keep any kind of UV divergences under control within our method, since we are working with the regularized quantities. At the same time, the existence of a mass gap responsible for the IR structure of the full gluon propagator does not depend on whether overlapping divergences are present or not in the SD equations and corresponding skeleton expansions. As argued above, the existence of a mass gap is only due to the TVCGI/S. All this is the main reason why our starting point is the standard gluon SD equation (3.6) for the unrenormalized (but necessarily regularized) Green's functions (this also simplifies notations). For some preliminary discussion of the renormalization of the regularized mass gap see section VI below.

V. RESTORATION OF THE TRANSVERSALITY OF GAUGE BOSONS

Many important quantities in QCD, such as the gluon and quark condensates, the topological susceptibility, the Bag constant (see discussion below), etc., are defined only beyond the PT [24, 25, 26]. This means that they are determined by such S -matrix elements (correlation functions) from which all types of the PT contributions should be, by definition, subtracted. It is worth emphasizing that these subtractions are inevitable also for the sake of self-consistency. In low-energy QCD there exist relations between different correlation functions, for example, the Witten-Veneziano (WV) and Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner (GMOR) formulae. The former [27, 28] relates the pion decay constant and the mass of the η' meson to the topological susceptibility. The latter [25, 29] relates the chiral quark condensate to the pion decay constant and its mass. The famous trace anomaly relation (see, for example Refs. [25, 28] and references therein) relates the above-mentioned Bag constant to the gluon and quark condensates. Defining thus the topological susceptibility and the gluon and quark condensates by the subtraction of all types of the PT contributions, it would not be self-consistent to retain them in the correlation function, determining the pion decay constant, and in the expressions for the pion and η' meson masses.

Anyway, to calculate correctly any truly NP quantity from first principles in low-energy QCD one has to begin with making subtractions at the fundamental quark-gluon level. So let us briefly formulate here a general method how

to make the gluon propagator relevant for the NP QCD to be automatically free of the PT contributions (for more detailed formulation see Ref. [30]). Using the exact decomposition (4.18), let us define the INP gluon propagator by the corresponding subtraction as follows:

$$D_{\mu\nu}^{INP}(q; \Delta^2) = D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) - D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2 = 0) = D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) - D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q), \quad (5.1)$$

so that the full gluon propagator becomes an exact sum of the two different terms

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) = D_{\mu\nu}^{INP}(q; \Delta^2) + D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q), \quad (5.2)$$

in complete agreement with Eq. (4.18). The principal difference between the full gluon propagator $D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2)$ and the INP gluon propagator $D_{\mu\nu}^{INP}(q; \Delta^2)$ is that the latter one is free of the PT contributions, while the former one, being also NP, is "contaminated" by them. Also, the INP gluon propagator is manifestly transversal, i.e., does not depend explicitly on the gauge-fixing parameter (see below). This results in the fact that the longitudinal term of the full gluon propagator is contained in its PT part, because of the restoration of the color gauge invariance/symmetry at the final stage within our approach. So after subtraction it is cancelled in the INP gluon propagator, which otherwise cannot not be really transversal. Since the formal PT limit $\Delta^2 = 0$ is uniquely defined in our method, the separation between the INP and PT gluon propagators is uniquely defined as well (let us note that the mass gap is either finite or zero—the PT limit—, i.e., it cannot be infinitely large at fixed λ). In general we distinguish between the two different phases (the INP and PT ones) in QCD not by the strength of the coupling constant, but by the presence of a mass gap (in this case the coupling constant plays no any role as it follows from our consideration).

Evidently, the subtraction (5.1) is equivalent to the subtraction made at the level of the full gluon form factor in Eq. (3.10) as follows:

$$d(q^2) = d(q^2) - d^{PT}(q^2) + d^{PT}(q^2) = d^{INP}(q^2) + d^{PT}(q^2). \quad (5.3)$$

It is worth emphasizing once more, that making the above-defined subtraction, we are achieving the two goals simultaneously: the transversality of the gluon propagator relevant for the truly NP QCD, and it automatically becomes free of the PT contributions ("PT contaminations") as well. So our prescription for the subtraction at the fundamental gluon level is simply reduced to the replacement of the general iteration solution by its INP part everywhere, i.e.,

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) \longrightarrow D_{\mu\nu}^{INP}(q; \Delta^2), \quad (5.4)$$

and/or equivalently

$$d(q^2; \Delta^2) \rightarrow d^{INP}(q^2; \Delta^2). \quad (5.5)$$

Their explicit expressions are given below. $D_{\mu\nu}^{INP}(q; \Delta^2)$ is the full gluon propagator, but free of the PT contributions. In addition, it is manifestly transversal. $d^{INP}(q^2; \Delta^2)$ is also free of the PT contributions. It can be considered as the INP effective charge, i.e., $d^{INP}(q^2; \Delta^2) \equiv \alpha_s^{INP}(q^2; \Delta^2)$, not losing generality. In other words, the replacements (5.4) and/or (5.5) are necessary to be made first at the fundamental gluon level in order to correctly calculate from first principles any truly NP physical quantities and processes in low-energy QCD as emphasized above.

The necessity of such kind of the subtraction and other types ones has been discussed and justified in our paper [30] (see also references therein), where some concrete examples are present as well. Let us discuss here in more detail one rich example of these subtractions. One of the main characteristics of the true QCD ground state is the Bag constant. It is just defined as the difference between the PT and NP vacuum energy densities (VEDs). So, we can symbolically put $B = VED^{PT} - VED$, where VED is the NP but "contaminated" by the PT contributions (i.e., this is a full VED like the full gluon propagator). At the same time, in accordance with our method we can continue as follows: $B = VED^{PT} - VED = VED^{PT} - [VED - VED^{PT} + VED^{PT}] = VED^{PT} - [VED^{NP} + VED^{PT}] = -VED^{NP} > 0$, since the VED is always negative. Thus the Bag constant is nothing but the truly NP VED, apart from the sign, by definition, and thus is completely free of the PT "contaminations". Symbolic subtraction presented here includes the subtraction at the fundamental gluon level, i.e., relation (5.3), and two others at the hadronic level, i.e., when the gluon degrees of freedom should be integrated out. For a concrete detailed procedure of how to define correctly and actually calculate the Bag constant from first principles by making all necessary subtractions at all levels on the basis

of our solution for the INP QCD see Ref. [31], where the relation between the Bag constant and gluon condensate is explicitly shown as well.

Concluding, the first necessary subtraction (5.1) makes the full gluon propagator, relevant for the NP QCD, automatically free of the PT contributions ("PT contaminations"), as well as purely transversal. The general role of ghost degrees of freedom is to cancel the longitudinal term in the full gluon propagator in every order of the PT, going thus beyond it. Though not compromising their general role in the PT QCD, from our consideration, nevertheless, it clearly follows that we do not need them for this purpose. However, this does not mean that we need no ghosts at all. Of course, we need them in other sectors of QCD, for example in the quark-gluon ST identity, which contains the so-called ghost-quark scattering kernel explicitly [1]. It possesses an important piece of information on quark degrees of freedom themselves. It should be taken into account in order to correctly derive confining quark propagator (for preliminary derivation see Ref. [32] and references therein).

VI. THE CONFINING POTENTIAL AND RENORMALIZATION OF THE MASS GAP

Thus the full gluon propagator which is relevant for the NP QCD within our approach is as follows:

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) = iT_{\mu\nu}(q)d(q^2; \Delta^2)\frac{1}{q^2} = iT_{\mu\nu}(q)\frac{\Delta^2}{(q^2)^2}f(q^2), \quad (6.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f(q^2) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\Delta^2/q^2)^k \Phi_k(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2), \\ \Phi_k(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{k,m}(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2), \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

and the effective charge in this case is to be defined as follows:

$$d(q^2; \Delta^2) \equiv \alpha_s(q^2; \Delta^2) = \frac{\Delta^2}{q^2} f(q^2). \quad (6.3)$$

Evidently, after making the above-described subtractions or equivalently the replacements (5.4) and (5.5), we can omit the superscript "INP" (this simplifies notations).

Let us recall some remarkable features of the full gluon propagator (6.1) (for additional discussion see the above-mentioned our paper [30]). First of all, it depends only on the transversal degrees of freedom of gauge bosons, while the non-explicit dependence on the gauge-fixing parameter ξ remains, of course. Also, its functional dependence is uniquely fixed up to the expressions for the residues $\Phi_k(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$, and it is valid in the whole energy/momentum range. At large momentum it looks formally as an Operator Product Expansion (OPE) of the gluon propagator. However, it is suppressed in this limit ($q^2 \rightarrow \infty$), and thus it is free of the above-discussed overlapping divergences, which plague the dominating in this limit the PT part of the full gluon propagator. It explicitly depends on the mass gap, so that when it formally goes to zero this solution vanishes, as well as it is free of the PT "contaminations" due to the character of severe IR singularities. No approximation/truncations and no special gauge choice have been made for the corresponding regularized constant skeleton loop integrals, contributing to the residues $\Phi_k(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$ over all iterations, labelled by m in Eq. (6.2). The full gluon propagator (6.1) has a drastically different behavior in the deep IR region ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$) from the free gluon propagator, which is determined by the explicit presence of the mass gap.

A. The Weierstrass-Sokhocky-Kazorati theorem

A new surprising feature of this solution is that its both asymptotics at zero ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$) and at infinity ($q^2 \rightarrow \infty$) are to be determined by its $(q^2)^{-2}$ structure only. This structure determines the behavior of the solution (6.1) at infinity, since all other terms in the expansion (6.1) are suppressed in this limit, and the behavior of this structure at infinity is not dangerous. So the main problem with our solution (6.1) is its structure in the deep IR region ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$). Fortunately, there exist two mathematical theories which are of a great help in this case. We have already mentioned

the DT which should be complemented by the DRM. However, let us begin with the theory of functions of complex variable [33], which explains the behavior of our solution (6.1) in the deep IR region.

The function $f(q^2)$ is defined by its Laurent expansion, and thus it has an isolated essentially singular point at $q^2 = 0$. Its behavior in the neighborhood of this point is regulated by the Weierstrass-Sokhocky-Kazorati (WSK) theorem which tells that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(q_n^2) = Z, \quad q_n^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad (6.4)$$

where Z is any complex number, and $\{q_n^2\}$ is a sequence of points $q_1^2, q_2^2, \dots, q_n^2$, for which the above-displayed limit always exists. Of course, Z remains arbitrary (it depends on the chosen sequence of points), but in general it depends on the same set of parameters as the residues, i.e., $Z \equiv Z(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$. This theorem thus allows one to replace the Laurent expansion $f(q^2)$ by Z when $q^2 \rightarrow 0$, i.e.,

$$f(0; \lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) \rightarrow Z(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2). \quad (6.5)$$

There is no doubt that the only real severe (i.e., NP) IR singularity of the full gluon propagator (6.1) is the $(q^2)^{-2}$ NP IR singularity, while the Laurent expansion $f(q^2)$ should be treated in accordance with the WSK theorem.

Our consideration at this stage is necessarily formal, since the mass gap remains unrenormalized yet as well as all other quantities. So far it has been only regularized, i.e., $\Delta^2 \equiv \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$. However, a preliminary explanation of the renormalization of the mass gap can be given even at this stage. Due to the above-formulated WSK theorem, the full gluon propagator (6.1) becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) = iT_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{1}{(q^2)^2} Z(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2), \quad (6.6)$$

not losing generality, so just the $(q^2)^{-2}$ -structure of the full gluon propagator (6.1) is all that matters, indeed. Let us now define the renormalized (R) mass gap as follows:

$$\Delta_R^2 = Z(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2) \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2), \quad (6.7)$$

so that we consider $Z(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$ as the multiplicative renormalization constant for the mass gap, and Δ_R^2 is the physical mass gap within our approach. Precisely this quantity should be positive (due to the WSK theorem, we can always choose such Z in order to make Δ_R^2 positive), finite, gauge-independent, etc. In other words, it should exist when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ and $\alpha = 0$ (for a more detailed consideration see below).

Thus the full gluon propagator relevant for the truly NP QCD (or equivalently INP QCD) finally becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta_R^2) = iT_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{\Delta_R^2}{(q^2)^2}. \quad (6.8)$$

The renormalization of the mass gap is an example of the NP renormalization. The corresponding renormalization constant $Z(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$ appears naturally, so the general renormalizability of QCD is not affected. Since we were able to accumulate all the quadratic divergences into the renormalization of the mass gap, the $(q^2)^{-2}$ -type behavior of the relevant gluon propagator (6.8) at infinity is not dangerous (as mentioned above), i.e., it cannot undermine the renormalizability of QCD. Moreover, in the subsequent paper we will show that the INP QCD is UV finite theory.

As emphasized above, the real problem with our solution (6.8) is the behavior at the origin ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$), since its IR singularity represents the so-called severe IR singularity, and the PT fails to deal with it. Before explaining in general terms how to correctly treat it within the DT, complemented by the DRM, let us make a few remarks in advance. It is well known that the gluon propagator (6.8) satisfies the Wilson criterion of quark confinement - Area law [34, 35]. Equivalently, it leads to the linear rising potential between heavy (static) quarks [36] "seen" by lattice QCD as well [37]. That is why we call it the confining potential. Let us emphasize, however, that our result (6.8) is exact, so it is neither IR nor UV asymptotic. One would think that it has a rather simple functional structure but this is not the case. A special regularization expansion is to be used in order to deal with its severe IR singularity (see Appendix B and discussion below).

Before going to the description of the IR multiplicative renormalization (IRMR) program, it is instructive to find explicitly the corresponding β -function. From Eq. (6.8) it follows that the effective charge is

$$\alpha_s(q^2; \Delta_R^2) = \frac{\Delta_R^2}{q^2}. \quad (6.9)$$

Then from the renormalization group equation for the renormalized effective charge (6.9), which determines the β -function,

$$q^2 \frac{d\alpha_s(q^2; \Delta_R^2)}{dq^2} = \beta(\alpha_s(q^2; \Delta_R^2)), \quad (6.10)$$

it simply follows that

$$\beta(\alpha_s(q^2; \Delta_R^2)) = -\alpha_s(q^2; \Delta_R^2). \quad (6.11)$$

Thus, one can conclude that the corresponding β -function as a function of its argument is always in the domain of attraction (i.e., negative). So it has no IR stable fixed point indeed as it is required for the confining theory [1].

B. IR multiplicative renormalization (IRMR)

Let us show now that expression (6.8) is an exact result, and it is neither IR nor UV asymptotic as underlined above. For this purpose, it is instructive to begin with the initial expressions (6.1) and (6.2). Because of the summation over k , nothing should depend on it. This is in agreement with what we already know from the WSK theorem. Thus the only NP IR singularity of Eq. (6.8) is its $(q^2)^{-2}$ -structure. If q is an independent skeleton loop variable, then the dimensional regularization of this NP IR singularity is given by the expansion (B7) at $k = 0$, namely

$$(q^2)^{-2} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[a(0) \delta^4(q) + O(\epsilon) \right], \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+, \quad (6.12)$$

and $a(0) = \pi^2$ (see Appendix B). Due to the $\delta^4(q)$ function in the residue of this expansion, all the test functions which appear under corresponding skeleton loop integrals should be finally replaced by their expression at $q = 0$. So Eq. (6.1) effectively becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) = iT_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{\Delta^2}{(q^2)^2} f(0), \quad (6.13)$$

and taking into account the replacement (6.5) (i.e., result of the WSK theorem) and the definition (6.7), one finally arrives at Eq. (6.8), indeed. The only problem remaining to solve is how to remove the pole $1/\epsilon$ which necessarily appears in the full gluon propagator. After substituting of the dimensionally regularized expansion (6.12) into the Eq. (6.8) or equivalently into the Eq. (6.13), it becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta_R^2) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} iT_{\mu\nu}(q) \Delta_R^2 \delta^4(q), \quad (6.14)$$

where we include π^2 into the renormalized mass gap and retain, for convenience, the same notation. For simplicity, the terms of the order $O(\epsilon)$ are not shown.

As emphasized in Appendix B, in the presence of the IR regularization parameter ϵ all the Green's functions and parameters depend in general on it. The only way to remove the pole in ϵ from the full gluon propagator (6.14) is to define the IR renormalized mass gap as follows:

$$\Delta_R^2 = X(\epsilon) \bar{\Delta}_R^2 = \epsilon \bar{\Delta}_R^2, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+, \quad (6.15)$$

where $X(\epsilon) = \epsilon$ is the IRMR constant for the mass gap, and the IR renormalized mass gap $\bar{\Delta}_R^2$ exists as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, by definition, contrary to Δ_R^2 . In both expressions for the mass gap the dependence on ϵ is assumed but not shown explicitly. Evidently, after the IR renormalization of the mass gap, the terms of the order $O(\epsilon)$ become the terms of

the order $O(\epsilon^2)$. After going to the IR renormalized quantities they can be omitted from the consideration without any problems.

The important observation is that the renormalization of the mass gap automatically IR renormalizes the full gluon propagator as well, i.e., its IRMR constant is $X(\epsilon) = \epsilon$, so $D_{\mu\nu}(q) = X(\epsilon)\bar{D}_{\mu\nu}(q)$. The IR and UV renormalized gluon propagator becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \bar{\Delta}_R^2) = iT_{\mu\nu}(q)\bar{\Delta}_R^2\delta^4(q), \quad (6.16)$$

where we introduce the notation $\bar{D}_{\mu\nu}(q) \equiv D_{\mu\nu}(q; \bar{\Delta}_R^2)$. In a subsequent paper we will show that the IR renormalization of the full gluon propagator or equivalently of the mass gap is completely sufficient to remove all severe IR singularities (parameterized in terms of the IR regularization parameter ϵ and introduced within the DT, complemented by DRM) from all the multi-loop skeleton integrals which may appear in the INP QCD. So this theory is IR renormalizable as well. However, let us note in advance that beyond one-loop skeleton integrals the analysis should be done in a more sophisticated way. Instead of the δ function in the residues its derivatives will appear. They should be treated in the sense of the DT. Fortunately, as mentioned in Appendix B, the IR renormalization of the theory is not undermined, since a pole in ϵ is always a simple pole $1/\epsilon$ for each independent skeleton loop variable (see expansion (B7)).

C. The general criterion of gluon confinement

Let us now substitute the definition (6.15) into the gluon propagator (6.8), i.e, express it in terms of the IR renormalized mass gap. Then one obtains

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \bar{\Delta}_R^2) = \epsilon \times iT_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{\bar{\Delta}_R^2}{(q^2)^2}, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (6.17)$$

Due to the distribution nature of severe IR singularities, the two principally different cases should be separately considered.

1). If the gluon momentum q is an independent skeleton loop variable, then, as emphasized repeatedly above, the initial $(q^2)^{-2}$ severe IR singularity should be regularized with the help of the expansion (6.12). Finally one arrives at Eq. (6.16) in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ limit as it should be. It makes sense to note here that if under the integrals the effective charge (6.9) is multiplied by at least $(q^2)^{-1}$, then the IR renormalization of the mass gap is needed, otherwise – not.

2). If, however, the gluon momentum q is not a skeleton loop variable (i.e., it is external momentum), then the initial $(q^2)^{-2}$ severe IR singularity cannot be treated as the distribution, i.e., the regularization expansion (6.12) is not the case to use. The function $(q^2)^{-2}$ is a standard one, and the gluon propagator (6.17) vanishes as ϵ goes to zero, i.e.,

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \bar{\Delta}_R^2) = \epsilon \times iT_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{\bar{\Delta}_R^2}{(q^2)^2} \sim \epsilon, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (6.18)$$

It is worth emphasizing that the final $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ limit is permitted to take only after expressing all the Green's functions and parameters in terms of their IR renormalized counterparts because they, by definition, exist in this limit. This behavior is gauge-invariant and prevents the transversal gluons to appear in asymptotic states. We consider it as the exact criterion of gluon confinement, and thus color gluons can never be isolated. For the first time it has been obtained in Ref. [10].

Concluding, in multi-loop skeleton diagrams containing gluon propagators or external gluon legs the starting expression for them within our approach is always Eq. (6.17). If q is an independent skeleton loop variable, then one arrives at Eq. (6.16), otherwise at Eq. (6.18). As mentioned above, the derivatives of the δ function may also appear when the number of independent skeleton loop variables does not coincide with the number of the gluon propagators (more detailed analysis has to be done).

D. The general criterion of quark confinement

It is instructive to formulate here the quark confinement criterion as well in advance. It consists of two independent conditions.

1). The *first necessary* condition, formulated at the fundamental (microscopic) quark-gluon level, is the absence of the pole-type singularities in the quark Green's function at any gauge on the real axis at some finite point in the complex momentum space, i.e.,

$$S(p) \neq \frac{Z_2}{\hat{p} - m_{ph}}, \quad (6.19)$$

where Z_2 is the standard quark wave function renormalization constant, while m_{ph} is the mass to which a physical meaning could be assigned. In other words, the quark always remains an off-mass-shell object. Such an understanding (interpretation) of quark confinement comes apparently from Gribov's approach to quark confinement [38] and Preparata's massive quark model (MQM) in which external quark legs were approximated by entire functions [39]. A quark propagator may or may not be an entire function, but in any case the pole of the first order (like the electron propagator has in QED) should disappear (see, for example Refs. [32, 40] and references therein).

2). The *second sufficient* condition, formulated at the hadronic (macroscopic) level, is the existence of the discrete spectrum only (no continuum) in bound-states, in order to prevent quarks to appear in asymptotic states. This condition comes apparently from 't Hooft's model for two-dimensional QCD with N_c large limit [41] (see also Refs. [16, 32]).

At nonzero temperature and density, for example in quark-gluon plasma (QGP), the bound-states will be dissolved, so the second sufficient condition does not work anymore. However, the first necessary condition remains always valid, of course. In other words, by increasing temperature or density there is no way to put quarks on the mass-shell. So what is known as the Deconfinement phase transition in QGP is in fact the Dehadronization phase transition.

This definition of quark confinement in the momentum space is gauge-invariant, flavor independent, etc., and thus it is a general one. At the same time, the above-mentioned quark confinement criterion formulated in the configuration space - Area law (and equivalently the linear rising potential) - is relevant only for heavy quarks.

E. Physical limits

We introduced the renormalized mass gap (6.7), defining its existence when the dimensionless UV regulating parameter λ goes to infinity, i.e., in the $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit. However, nothing was said about the behavior of the coupling constant squared g^2 in this limit. In general it may also depend on λ , becoming thus the so-called "running" effective charge $g^2 \sim \alpha_s \equiv \alpha_s(\lambda)$. Evidently, nothing will be changed in our results if we choose the subtraction point α at zero, i.e., put $\alpha = 0$. We also omit the dependence on the gauge-fixing parameter ξ as unimportant for future discussion. Thus the definition (6.7) can be written down in the generalized version as follows:

$$M^2 = Z(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)) \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)), \quad (6.20)$$

where we introduce the auxiliary finite mass squared parameter M^2 . Since the regularized effective charge depends on λ , all the possible types of its behavior in the $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit should be considered independently from each other.

1). If $\alpha_s(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, then one recovers the strong coupling regime. It is nothing but the INP phase within our approach. Evidently, just this limit has been defined as the renormalized mass gap (6.7), i.e., in fact

$$M^2 = Z(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)) \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)) = \Delta_R^2, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad \alpha_s(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.21)$$

2). If $\alpha_s(\lambda) \rightarrow c$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, where c is a finite constant, then it can be put to one, not losing generality. This means that the effective charge becomes unity, and this is only possible for the free gluon propagator. However, the free gluon propagator contains none of mass scale parameters, so M^2 in this limit is to be zero, i.e., in fact

$$M^2 = Z(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)) \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)) = 0, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad \alpha_s(\lambda) \rightarrow 1. \quad (6.22)$$

3). If $\alpha_s(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, then one recovers the weak coupling regime. It is nothing but the PT phase within our approach. Evidently, this limit has to be defined as Λ_{QCD}^2 , i.e., in fact

$$M^2 = Z(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)) \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)) = \Lambda_{QCD}^2, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad \alpha_s(\lambda) \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.23)$$

A few remarks are in order. Due to the above-formulated WSK theorem, the number Z depends on the chosen sequence of points along which the gluon momentum squared goes to zero. For the first and third cases we can choose it in order to provide a finite different limits, while for the second case it can be chosen in order to provide a zero limit. Thus these three different regimes are in agreement with the theory of functions of complex variable [33]. The PT phase is determined by the subtracted part of the gluon self-energy, which may be only logarithmic divergent as emphasized above. So $\Lambda_{QCD}^2 \equiv \Lambda_{PT}^2$ may effectively appear under logarithms only, leading finally to AF. In Ref. [42] it has been noticed that being numerically a few hundred MeV only, Λ_{QCD}^2 cannot survive in the UV limit, so none of the finite mass scale parameters can be determined by the PT QCD. It should come from the IR, being thus NP by origin as was just described above.

Our mass gap $\bar{\Delta}_R^2$ determines the power-type deviation of the full gluon propagator from the free one in the IR limit ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$). This region (small q^2) is interesting for all the NP effects in QCD, first of all color confinement. This once more emphasizes the close intrinsic link between the behavior of QCD at large distances and its NP dynamics. At the same time, asymptotic QCD scale parameter Λ_{QCD} determines much more weaker logarithmic deviation of the full gluon propagator from the free one in the UV limit ($q^2 \rightarrow \infty$). From our consideration it follows that both effects (AF and color confinement) are due to the existence of the mass gap in QCD. In QED neither AF nor confinement takes place because there is no mass gap at all. There is no doubt left that due to renormalization quadratic divergences parameterized as the regularized mass gap Δ^2 may be absorbed in a redefinition of two various masses leading to the above-mentioned two physical mass gaps Λ_{NP}^2 and Λ_{PT}^2 .

VII. DISCUSSION

Let us denote the version of our mass gap which appears in the S -matrix elements for the corresponding physical quantities/processes in low-energy QCD as Λ_{NP}^2 (in principle they may be slightly different, indeed). Then a symbolic relation between it and the initial mass gap Δ^2 and Λ_{PT}^2 could be written as follows:

$$\Lambda_{NP}^2 \xleftarrow[\infty \leftarrow \lambda]{\infty \leftarrow \alpha_s} \Delta^2 \xrightarrow[\lambda \rightarrow \infty]{\alpha_s \rightarrow 0} \Lambda_{PT}^2. \quad (7.1)$$

Here α_s is obviously the fine structure coupling constant of strong interactions. The right-hand-side limit is well known as the weak coupling regime, and we know how to take it within the renormalization group equations approach [1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9]. The left-hand-side limit can be regarded as the strong coupling regime, and we hope that we have explained here how to begin to deal with it, proposing and formulating nonlinear iteration procedure. However, there is no doubt that the final goal of this limit, namely, the mass gap Λ_{NP} exists, and should be renormalization group invariant in the same way as Λ_{QCD} . It is solely responsible for the large-scale structure of the true QCD ground state, while Λ_{PT} is responsible for the nontrivial PT dynamics there.

Evidently, a relation of the type (7.1) is only possible due to the explicit presence of a mass gap in the full gluon propagator and in the gluon SD equation of motion. It leads to the exact separation between the truly NP and nontrivial PT parts (phases) at the level of a single gluon propagator. A possible relation between these two phases shown in Eq. (7.1) is a manifestation that "the problems encountered in perturbation theory are not mere mathematical artifacts but rather signify deep properties of the full theory" [43]. The message that we are trying to convey is that the nontrivial PT phase in the full gluon propagator indicates the existence of the truly NP one (the INP one within the general iteration solution) and the other way around.

A few years ago Jaffe and Witten have formulated the following theorem [5]:

Yang-Mills Existence And Mass Gap: Prove that for any compact simple gauge group G , quantum Yang-Mills theory on $\mathbf{R}^4$ exists and has a mass gap $\Delta > 0$.

Of course, to prove the existence of the Yang-Mills (YM) theory with compact simple gauge group G is a formidable task yet. It is rather a mathematical than a physical problem. However, our main results obtained in this work can be formulated similar to the above-mentioned Jaffe-Witten (JW) theorem as follows:

Mass Gap Existence: If quantum Yang-Mills theory with compact simple gauge group $G = SU(3)$ exists on $\mathbf{R}^4$, then it has a mass gap and confines gluons.

From the JW presentation of their theorem it clearly follows that their mass gap is to be identified with our mass gap, after subtracting all types of the PT contributions at all levels in the S matrix elements for the corresponding physical quantities/processes (see symbolic relation (7.1)). On the other hand, in the AF regime (when all the NP contributions are suppressed) the mass gap Δ^2 is to be identified with the asymptotic scale squared (see again symbolic

relation (7.1)). QCD as a formal theory of quark-gluon interactions has a mass gap Δ^2 which is only regularized, and therefore there is no guarantee that it is positive. It cannot be related directly to any of physical quantities/processes. As actual theory of strong interactions its two different faces come into the play: INP QCD for low-energy physics with its mass gap Λ_{NP}^2 and PT QCD for high-energy physics with its mass gap $\Lambda_{PT}^2 \equiv \Lambda_{QCD}^2$. Both mass gaps have now physical meanings (they are finite, positive, gauge-invariant, etc.). How Δ^2 becomes either Λ_{NP}^2 or Λ_{PT}^2 is already explained. Apparently, there is no intersection between them. Similarly to the symbolic relation (7.1), the symbolic relation between formal QCD and its two physical phases is

$$INP\ QCD \Leftarrow QCD \Rightarrow PT\ QCD, \quad (7.2)$$

so formal QCD has no physical mass gap, while its two phases do have as described above. PT QCD is AF, while INP QCD confines gluons. In the subsequent paper we will show that this theory will confine quarks as well as will explain spontaneous breakdown of chiral symmetry. Evidently, it has the mass gap which is only one responsible for the scale of all the NP effects and processes in the theory of strong interactions.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

There is no doubt that our approach to the NP QCD will survive both multiplicative renormalization (MR) programs. In principle, the UVMR program is not our problem (it is a standard one [1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11]). Within the INP solution to QCD our problem is the IRMR program in order to render the whole theory finite, i.e., to make it free from all types of severe IR singularities parameterized in terms of the IR regularization parameter as it goes to zero at the final stage. It is not a simple task due to its novelty and really NP character. It requires much more tedious technical work how to correctly implement the DRM into the DT, and it is left to be done elsewhere. Anyway, for the sake of self-consistency it should be done in the framework of the whole system of the SD equations, complemented by the corresponding ST identities. However, the UV and IR renormalization of the mass gap described here will be valid for the renormalization of the above-mentioned system of equations as well.

It is important to emphasize that the mass gap Δ^2 has not been introduced by hand. It is hidden in the skeleton loop integrals, contributing to the full gluon self-energy, and dynamically generated mainly due to the NL interaction of massless gluon modes. No truncations/approximations and no special gauge choice are made for the above-mentioned regularized skeleton loop integrals. An appropriate subtraction scheme has been applied to make the existence of a mass gap perfectly clear. Within the general iteration solution the mass gap shows up explicitly when the gluon momentum goes to zero. The Lagrangian of QCD does not contain a mass gap, while it explicitly appears in the gluon SD equation of motion. This once more underlines the importance of the investigation of the SD system of equations and identities [1, 2, 8, 9] for understanding the true structure of the QCD ground state. We have established the structure of the regularized full gluon propagator (see Eqs. (3.10) and (3.11)) and the corresponding SD equation (3.7) in the presence of a mass gap (see also Appendix A).

In order to realize a mass gap (more precisely its regularized version), we propose not to impose the transversality condition on the gluon self-energy, while preserving the color gauge invariance condition (3.9) for the full gluon propagator. Such a temporary violation of color gauge invariance/symmetry (TVCGI/S) is completely NP effect because in the formal PT limit $\Delta^2 = 0$ this effect vanishes. Since the gluon is not a physical state due to color confinement, the TVCGI/S in QCD has no direct physical consequences. None of physical quantities/processes in low-energy QCD will be directly affected by this proposal.

In QED a mass gap is always in the "gauge prison". It cannot be realized even temporarily, since the photon is a physical state. However, in QCD a door of the "color gauge prison" can be opened for a moment in order to realize a mass gap, because the gluon is not a physical state. A key to this "door" is the constant skeleton tadpole term, which explicitly violates the transversality of the full gluon self-energy [30]. On the other hand, this "door" can be opened without a key (as any door) by not imposing the transversality condition on the full gluon self-energy. So in QED a mass gap cannot be "liberated" from the vacuum, while photons and electrons can be liberated from the vacuum in order to be physical states. In QCD a mass gap can be "liberated" from the vacuum, while gluons and quarks cannot be liberated from the vacuum in order to be physical states. In other words, there is no breakdown of $U(1)$ gauge symmetry in QED because the photon is a physical state. At the same time, a temporary breakdown of $SU(3)$ color gauge symmetry in QCD is possible because the gluon is not a physical state (color confinement).

For the calculations of physical observables from first principles in low-energy QCD we need the full gluon propagator, which transversality has been sacrificed in order to realize a mass gap. However, we have already pointed out how the transversality of the gluon propagator relevant for the NP QCD is to be restored at the final stage. In accordance with our prescription it becomes automatically transversal, free of the PT contributions ("contaminations"), and it

regularly depends on the mass gap, so that it vanishes when the mass gap goes to zero. The role of the first necessary subtraction (5.1) at the fundamental gluon propagator level is to be underlined.

Let us emphasize once more that no truncations/approximations and no special gauge have been made for the corresponding skeleton loop integrals within our approach, i.e., it is pure NP, by its nature. So on the general ground we have established that our solution (6.1), which is relevant for the NP QCD, is always severely singular in the IR ($q^2 \rightarrow 0$), i.e., the gluons always remain massless, and this does not depend on the gauge choice. Moreover, the corresponding IR and UV MR programs clearly show that its $(q^2)^{-2}$ structure is only important. It leads to the formulation for the first time of the exact criterion of gluon confinement (6.18), so it is confining solution, indeed, see Eq. (6.8). This behavior of the full gluon propagator in different approximations and gauges has been earlier obtained and investigated in many papers (see, for example Ref. [10] and references therein). We have confirmed and thus revitalized these investigations, in which this behavior has been obtained as an IR asymptotic solution to the gluon SD equation. **However, let us emphasize once more that our result is exact and gauge-invariant, i.e., it is not IR asymptotic.** In other words, it is analytically proven that the full gluon propagator relevant for the truly NP QCD (or equivalently INP QCD) and the corresponding effective charge as a functions of the gluon momentum squared are exactly given in Eqs. (6.8) and (6.9), respectively. In the above-mentioned subsequent paper this result will be used in order to derive confining quark propagator. It is worth noting that in our previous work [30], the massive-type solution, leading to an effective gluon mass, has been also obtained. It becomes smooth in the Landau gauge only (in this connection see Ref. [44] and references therein).

In summary, QCD as theory of quark-gluon interactions has a mass gap Δ^2 , possibly realized in accordance with our proposal. The dynamically generated mass gap is usually related to breakdown of some symmetry (for example, the dynamically generated quark mass is an evidence of chiral symmetry breakdown). Here a mass gap is an evidence of the TVCGI/S. In the presence of a mass gap the coupling constant plays no role. This is also a direct evidence of the "dimensional transmutation", $g^2 \rightarrow \Delta^2(\lambda, \alpha, \xi, g^2)$ [1, 45, 46], which occurs whenever a massless theory acquires masses dynamically. It is a general feature of spontaneous symmetry breaking in field theories. At the hadronic level the QCD mass gap Δ^2 undergoes two phase transitions, becoming either Λ_{NP}^2 responsible for the large-scale QCD dynamics or Λ_{PT}^2 responsible for its nontrivial short-scale dynamics. Correspondingly, INP QCD and PT QCD are "two sides of the same coin"—QCD as a fundamental theory of quark-gluon interactions.

Acknowledgments

Support in part by HAS-JINR and Hungarian OTKA-T043455 grants (P. Levai) is to be acknowledged. The author is grateful to A. Kacharava, N. Nikolaev, P. Forgacs, L. Palla, J. Nyiri, T. Biro and especially to C. Hanhart and A. Kvinikhidze for useful discussions and remarks during his stay at IKP (Juelich).

APPENDIX A: GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THE GLUON SD EQUATION

Our strategy is not to impose the transversality condition on the gluon self-energy in order to realize a mass gap, and only after to impose the color gauge invariance condition on the full gluon propagator. To show that this works, it is instructive to substitute directly the subtracted gluon self-energy (3.5) into the gluon SD equation (3.6). Then one obtains

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) + D_{\mu\rho}^0(q)i[T_{\rho\sigma}(q)q^2\Pi_1^s(q^2; D) + q_\rho q_\sigma \Pi_2^s(q^2; D)]D_{\sigma\nu}(q) + D_{\mu\sigma}^0(q)i\Delta^2(\lambda; D)D_{\sigma\nu}(q). \quad (A1)$$

Let us now introduce the general tensor decompositions of the full and auxiliary free gluon propagators

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = i[T_{\mu\nu}(q)d(q^2) + L_{\mu\nu}(q)d_1(q^2)]\frac{1}{q^2} \quad (A2)$$

and

$$D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) = i[T_{\mu\nu}(q) + L_{\mu\nu}(q)d_0(q^2)]\frac{1}{q^2}, \quad (A3)$$

respectively. The form factor $d_0(q^2)$ introduced into the unphysical part of the auxiliary free gluon propagator $D_{\mu\nu}^0(q)$ is needed in order to explicitly show that the longitudinal part of the subtracted gluon self-energy $\Pi_2^s(q^2; D)$ plays no role.

The color gauge invariance condition imposed on the full gluon propagator

$$q_\mu q_\nu D_{\mu\nu}(q) = i\xi, \quad (\text{A4})$$

implies $d_1(q^2) = \xi$, so that the full gluon propagator becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = i \left\{ T_{\mu\nu}(q) d(q^2) + \xi L_{\mu\nu}(q) \right\} \frac{1}{q^2}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Substituting all these decompositions into the gluon SD equation (A1), one obtains

$$d(q^2) = \frac{1}{1 + \Pi_1^s(q^2; D) + (\Delta^2(\lambda; D)/q^2)}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

and

$$d_0(q^2) = \frac{\xi}{1 - \xi[\Pi_2^s(q^2; D) + (\Delta^2(\lambda; D)/q^2)]}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

However, the auxiliary free gluon propagator defined in Eqs. (A3) and (A7) is to be equivalently replaced as follows:

$$D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) \Rightarrow D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) + i\xi L_{\mu\nu}(q) d_0(q^2) \left[\Pi_2^s(q^2; D) + \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^2} \right] \frac{1}{q^2}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where from now on $D_{\mu\nu}^0(q)$ in the right-hand-side is the standard free gluon propagator, i.e.,

$$D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) = i \left\{ T_{\mu\nu}(q) + \xi L_{\mu\nu}(q) \right\} \frac{1}{q^2}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

For further purposes it is convenient to introduce the following notations:

$$M(q^2) = \left[\Pi_2^s(q^2; D) + \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^2} \right], \quad d_0(q^2) = \frac{\xi}{1 - \xi M(q^2)}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

so that Eq. (A8) becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) \Rightarrow D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) + i\xi L_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{\xi M(q^2)}{1 - \xi M(q^2)} \frac{1}{q^2}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Then the gluon SD equation in the presence of the mass gap (A1) after substitution (A11) and doing some tedious algebra is also to be equivalently replaced as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu\nu}(q) = & D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) + D_{\mu\rho}^0(q) i T_{\rho\sigma}(q) q^2 \Pi_1^s(q^2; D) D_{\sigma\nu}(q) + D_{\mu\sigma}^0(q) i \Delta^2(\lambda; D) D_{\sigma\nu}(q) \\ & + i \xi L_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{1}{q^2} \left[-\xi \Pi_2^s(q^2; D) + \frac{\xi M(q^2)}{1 - \xi M(q^2)} \left[1 - \xi \Pi_2^s(q^2; D) - \xi \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^2} \right] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

and taking into account the first of notations (A10), one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu\nu}(q) = & D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) + D_{\mu\rho}^0(q) i T_{\rho\sigma}(q) q^2 \Pi_1^s(q^2; D) D_{\sigma\nu}(q) \\ & + D_{\mu\sigma}^0(q) i \Delta^2(\lambda; D) D_{\sigma\nu}(q) + i \xi^2 L_{\mu\nu}(q) \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^4}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A13})$$

Thus the gluon SD equation (A13) does not depend on $d_0(q^2)$ and $\Pi_2^s(q^2; D)$, i.e., they played their role and then retired from the scene. Our derivation explicitly shows that the longitudinal part of the subtracted gluon self-energy $\Pi_2^s(q^2; D)$ plays no role and can be put formally to zero without losing generality, and thus making the subtracted gluon self-energy purely transversal.

Using now the explicit expression for the free gluon propagator (A9) this equation can be easily simplified to

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) - T_{\mu\sigma}(q) \left[\Pi_1^s(q^2; D) + \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^2} \right] D_{\sigma\nu}(q), \quad (\text{A14})$$

which, of course, coincides with Eq. (3.7), and its "solution" is again Eq. (A6). Thus, we have established the general structure of the full gluon propagator (Eqs. (A5) and (A6)) and the corresponding gluon SD equation (A14), which is equivalent to the initial Eq. (A1), in the presence of a mass gap.

APPENDIX B: IR DIMENSIONAL REGULARIZATION WITHIN THE DISTRIBUTION THEORY

In general all the Green's functions in QCD are generalized functions, i.e., they are distributions. This is especially true for the NP IR singularities of the full gluon propagator due to the self-interaction of massless gluons in the QCD vacuum. They present a rather broad and important class of functions with algebraic singularities, i.e., functions with nonsummable singularities at isolated points [12] (at zero in our case). Roughly speaking, this means that all relations involving distributions should be considered under corresponding integrals, taking into account the smoothness properties of the corresponding space of test functions (for example, $\varphi(q)$ below. Let us note in advance that in the subsequent paper we will establish the space in which our generalized functions are continuous linear functionals).

Let us consider the positively definite ($P > 0$) squared (quadratic) Euclidean form

$$P(q) = q_0^2 + q_1^2 + q_2^2 + \dots + q_{n-1}^2 = q^2, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where n is the number of the components. The generalized function (distribution) $P^\lambda(q)$, where λ being in general an arbitrary complex number, is defined as

$$(P^\lambda, \varphi) = \int_{P>0} P^\lambda(q) \varphi(q) d^n q. \quad (\text{B2})$$

At $\text{Re}\lambda \geq 0$ this integral is convergent and is an analytic function of λ . Analytical continuation to the region $\text{Re}\lambda < 0$ shows that it has a simple pole at points [10, 12]

$$\lambda = -\frac{n}{2} - k, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (\text{B3})$$

In order to actually define the system of the SD equations in the deep IR domain, it is necessary to introduce the IR regularization parameter ϵ , defined as $D = n + 2\epsilon$, $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ within a gauge-invariant DRM [13]. As a result, all the Green's functions and "bare" parameters should be regularized with respect to ϵ (see below) which should be set to zero at the end of the computations. The structure of the NP IR singularities is then determined (when n is even number) as follows [12]:

$$(q^2)^\lambda = \frac{C_{-1}^{(k)}}{\lambda + (D/2) + k} + \text{finite terms}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

where the residue is

$$C_{-1}^{(k)} = \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{2^{2k} k! \Gamma((n/2) + k)} \times L^k \delta^n(q) \quad (\text{B5})$$

with $L = (\partial^2/\partial q_0^2) + (\partial^2/\partial q_1^2) + \dots + (\partial^2/\partial q_{n-1}^2)$.

Thus the regularization of the NP IR singularities (B2), on account of (B3), is nothing but the whole expansion in the corresponding powers of ϵ and not the separate term(s). Let us underline its most remarkable feature. The order

of singularity does not depend on λ , n and k . In terms of the IR regularization parameter ϵ it is always a simple pole $1/\epsilon$. This means that all power terms in Eq. (B4) will have the same singularity, i.e.,

$$(q^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}-k} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} C_{-1}^{(k)} + \text{finite terms}, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where we can put $D = n$ now (i.e., after introducing this expansion). By "finite terms" here and everywhere a number of necessary subtractions under corresponding integrals is understood [12]. However, the residue at a pole will be drastically changed from one power singularity to another. This means different solutions to the whole system of the SD equations for different set of numbers λ and k . Different solutions mean, in their turn, different vacua. In this picture different vacua are to be labelled by the two independent numbers: the exponent λ and k . At a given number of $D(=n)$ the exponent λ is always negative being integer if $D(=n)$ is an even number or fractional if $D(=n)$ is an odd number. The number k is always integer and positive and precisely it determines the corresponding residue at a simple pole, see Eq. (B3). It would not be surprising if these numbers were somehow related to the nontrivial topology of the QCD vacuum in any dimensions.

It is worth emphasizing that the structure of severe IR singularities in Euclidean space is much simpler than in Minkowski space, where kinematical (unphysical) singularities due to the light cone also exist [1, 12, 47] (in this connection let us remind that in Euclidean metrics $q^2 = 0$ implies $q_i = 0$ and vice-versa, while in Minkowski metrics this is not so). In this case it is rather difficult to untangle them correctly from the dynamical singularities, the only ones which are important for the calculation of any physical observable. Also, the consideration is much more complicated in the configuration space [12]. That is why we always prefer to work in the momentum space (where propagators do not depend explicitly on the number of dimensions) with Euclidean signature. We also prefer to work in the covariant gauges in order to avoid peculiarities of the non-covariant gauges [1, 48, 49], for example, how to untangle the gauge pole from the dynamical one.

In principle, none of the regularization schemes (how to introduce the IR regularization parameter in order to parameterize the NP IR divergences and thus to put them under control) should be introduced by hand. First of all, it should be well defined. Secondly, it should be compatible with the DT [12]. The DRM [13] is well defined, and here we have shown how it should be introduced into the DT (complemented by the number of subtractions, if necessary). Though the so-called $\pm i\epsilon$ regularization is formally equivalent to the regularization used in our paper (see again Ref. [12]), nevertheless, it is rather inconvenient for practical use. Especially this is true for the gauge-field propagators, which are substantially modified due to the response of the vacuum (the $\pm i\epsilon$ prescription is designated for and is applicable only to the theories with the PT vacua, indeed [38, 50]). Other regularization schemes are also available, for example, such as analytical regularization used in Ref. [16] or the so-called Speer's regularization [51]. However, they should be compatible with the DT as emphasized above. Anyway, not the regularization is important but the DT itself. Just this theory provides an adequate mathematical framework for the correct treatment of all the Green's functions in QCD, and in quantum YM theory in particular (apparently, for the first time the distribution nature of the Green's functions in quantum field theory has been recognized and used in Ref. [52]).

The regularization of the NP IR singularities in QCD is determined by the Laurent expansion (B4) at $n = 4$ as follows:

$$(q^2)^{-2-k} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} a(k) [\delta^4(q)]^{(k)} + f.t. = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[a(k) [\delta^4(q)]^{(k)} + O(\epsilon) \right], \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $a(k)$ is a finite constant depending only on k and $[\delta^4(q)]^{(k)}$ represents the k th derivative of the δ -function (see Eqs. (B4) and (B5)). We point out that after introducing this expansion everywhere one can fix the number of dimensions, i.e., put $D = n = 4$ for QCD without any further problems. Indeed there will be no other severe IR singularities with respect to ϵ as it goes to zero, but those explicitly shown in this expansion. Let us underline that, while the initial expansion (6.1) is the Laurent expansion in the inverse powers of the gluon momentum squared, the regularization expansion (B7) is the Laurent expansion in powers of ϵ . This means that its regular part is as follows: $f.t. = (q^2)^{-2-k} + \epsilon (q^2)^{-2-k} \ln q^2 + O(\epsilon^2)$, where for the unimportant here definition of the functional $(q^2)^{-2-k}$ see Ref. [12]. These terms, however, play no any role in the IRMR program which has been preliminary discussed in section VI. The regularization expansion (B7) takes place only in four-dimensional QCD with Euclidean signature. In other dimensions and/or Minkowski signature it is much more complicated as pointed out above. As it follows from this expansion any power-type NP IR singularity, including the simplest one at $k = 0$, scales as $1/\epsilon$ as it goes to zero. Just this plays a crucial role in the IR renormalization of the theory within our approach. Evidently, such kind of the dimensionally regularized expansion (B7) does not exist for the PT IR singularity, which is as much singular as $(q^2)^{-1}$ only.

In summary, first we have emphasized the distribution nature of the NP IR singularities. Secondly, we have explicitly shown how the DRM should be correctly implemented into the DT. This makes it possible to put severe IR singularities under firm mathematical control.

APPENDIX C: THE GLUON SD EQUATION AND ITS GENERAL ITERATION SOLUTION

Let us show explicitly that the general iteration solution (4.18)

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q; \Delta^2) = D_{\mu\nu}^{INP}(q; \Delta^2) + D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q) \quad (C1)$$

satisfies the gluon SD equation (3.7)

$$D_{\mu\nu}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) - T_{\mu\sigma}(q) \left[\Pi(q^2; D) + \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^2} \right] D_{\sigma\nu}(q), \quad (C2)$$

indeed (let us recall that we replace $\Pi_1^*(q^2; D) \rightarrow \Pi(q^2; D)$, for convenience). There is no doubt that our solution for the full gluon propagator (C1), obtained at the expense of remaining unknown its PT part, nevertheless, satisfies the gluon SD equation (C2), since it has been obtained by the direct iteration solution of this equation. To show this explicitly by substituting it back into the gluon SD equation (C2) is not a simple task, and this is to be done elsewhere. The problem is that the decomposition of the full gluon propagator into the INP and PT parts by regrouping the so-called mixed terms in section IV was a well defined procedure (there was an exact criterion how to distinguish between these two terms in a single D). However, to do the same at the level of the gluon SD equation itself, which is nonlinear in D , is not so obvious.

Fortunately, there exists a rather simple method as how to show explicitly that the INP part of the full gluon propagator can be completely decoupled from the rest of the gluon SD equation in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ limit. For this purpose, let us consider it as a function of ϵ rather than as a function of its momentum. There is no explicit integration over the gluon momentum q in the gluon SD equation (C2). As we already know, in this case the INP part of the full gluon propagator vanishes as ϵ goes to zero (see Eq. (6.18)). Then the full gluon propagator becomes $D_{\mu\nu}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q)$. At the same time, the PT part $D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q)$ can be considered as the IR renormalized from the very beginning, since it is free of the NP IR singularities, by construction, i.e., $D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q) \equiv \bar{D}_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q)$. On the other hand, the invariant function $\Pi(q^2; D)$ has been obtained by the corresponding subtraction procedure (see Eq. (3.3)). So it is free of quadratic divergences parameterized in terms of the mass gap squared (as mentioned above, it may have only logarithmic divergences). In fact, this means that effectively it depends not on D but on D^{PT} , i.e., $\Pi(q^2; D) \equiv \Pi(q^2; D^{PT})$. So Eq. (C2) becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) - T_{\mu\sigma}(q) \left[\Pi(q^2; D^{PT}) + \frac{\Delta^2(\lambda; D)}{q^2} \right] D_{\sigma\nu}^{PT}(q). \quad (C3)$$

In order to go to the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ limit in this equation, it is necessary to express the mass gap $\Delta^2(\lambda; D) = \Delta^2 \equiv \Delta^2(\lambda; \alpha, \xi, g^2)$ through its IR renormalized counterpart with the help of the definitions (6.7) and (6.15) which yield

$$\Delta^2 = Z^{-1} \Delta_R^2 = \epsilon \times Z^{-1} \bar{\Delta}_R^2, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (C4)$$

Let us remind now that the UVMR constant Z depends in general on a set of parameters: $\xi, \lambda, \alpha_s(\lambda)$ in the regime when both λ and $\alpha_s(\lambda)$ go to infinity (see Eq. (7.2)). That is the gauge-fixing parameter ξ is not IR renormalized, i.e., $\xi = \bar{\xi}$ follows from the relation $D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q) \equiv \bar{D}_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q)$ mentioned above. Thus Z cannot depend on ϵ when it goes to zero. This is in agreement with the theory of functions of complex variable (see WSK theorem above), where it is considered as the number, depending only on a sequence of points along which the gluon momentum goes to zero. Apparently, in this case it is indeed possible to distribute the dependence on ϵ between two mass gaps Δ^2 and Δ_R^2 , leaving thus relating dimensionless parameter Z^{-1} free of it. All this means that after substituting of this relation into the previous gluon SD equation, we can go to the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ limit. Then the gluon SD equation finally becomes

$$D_{\mu\nu}^{PT}(q) = D_{\mu\nu}^0(q) - T_{\mu\sigma}(q) \Pi(q^2; D^{PT}) D_{\sigma\nu}^{PT}(q). \quad (C5)$$

It is easy to check that its "solution" is the effective charge (A6) again, where the mass gap is removed in accordance with the relation (C4).

It is instructive to equivalently rewrite the previous equation as follows:

$$D^{PT}(q) = D^0(q) + D^0(q)O(q^2; D^{PT})D^{PT}(q), \quad (C6)$$

where we introduce the following notation $O(q^2; D^{PT}) = iq^2\Pi(q^2; D^{PT})$, as well as omit the Dirac indices, for convenience. By introducing it, we would like to underline that this composition is always of the order q^2 at any D^{PT} (let us note that it will be of this order even at any D). The nonlinear iteration solution of Eq. (C6) looks like

$$\begin{aligned} D^{PT}(q) &= D^0(q) + D^0(q)O(q^2; D^{PT})D^{PT}(q) \\ &= D^0(q) + D^0(q)O_1(q^2)D^0(q) + D^0(q)O_0(q^2)D^0(q)O_1(q^2)D^0(q) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (C7)$$

where $O_0(q^2) = O(q^2; D^0)$ and $O_1(q^2) = O(q^2; D^0 + D^{(1)})$ with $D^{(1)}(q) = D^0O_0(q^2)D^0$, and so on. Since the free gluon propagator $D^0(q) \sim (1/q^2)$, while all $O_n(q^2)$, $n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ are always of the order q^2 , the iteration solution (C7) will produce only the PT-type (i.e., $1/q^2$) IR singularities. This is in complete agreement with the IR structure of the PT part of the full gluon propagator in Eq. (4.18).

Thus the INP part of the full gluon propagator is automatically decoupled from the rest of the gluon SD equation as ϵ goes to zero at the final stage. Just in this sense should be understood in general terms the solution of the gluon SD equation within our approach, since it leaves the PT part of the solution undetermined. To show this explicitly by treating the INP part of the full gluon propagator as a function of its momentum and substituting the corresponding decomposition back to the nonlinear gluon SD equation is far more complicate case as mentioned above.

-
- [1] W. Marciano, H. Pagels, Phys. Rep. C 36 (1978) 137.
 - [2] M.E. Peskin, D.V. Schroeder, An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory (AW, Advanced Book Program, 1995).
 - [3] Confinement, Duality, and Nonperturbative Aspects of QCD, edited by P. van Baal, NATO ASI Series B: Physics, vol. 368 (Plenum, New York, 1997).
 - [4] Non-Perturbative QCD, Structure of the QCD vacuum, edited by K-I. Aoki, O. Miyamura and T. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. 131 (1998) 1.
 - [5] A. Jaffe, E. Witten, Yang-Mills Existence and Mass Gap, <http://www.claymath.org/prize-problems/>, <http://www.arthurjaffe.com>.
 - [6] V.N. Gribov, J. Nyiri, Quantum Electrodynamics, (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
 - [7] J.D. Bjorken, S.D. Drell, Relativistic Quantum Fields, (Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1978).
 - [8] C. Itzykson, J.-B. Zuber, Quantum Field Theory, (Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1984).
 - [9] T. Muta, Foundations of QCD, (Word Scientific, 1987).
 - [10] V. Gogohia, hep-ph/0311061.
 - [11] M. Baker, Ch. Lee, Phys. Rev. D 15 (1977) 2201.
 - [12] I.M. Gel'fand, G.E. Shilov, Generalized Functions, (Academic Press, New York, 1968), Vol. I.
 - [13] G. 't Hooft, M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B 44 (1972) 189.
 - [14] V. Gogohia, Phys. Lett. B 584 (2004) 225.
 - [15] V. Gogohia, Phys. Lett. B 618 (2005) 103.
 - [16] H. Pagels, Phys. Rev. D 15 (1977) 2991.
 - [17] L. Susskind, J. Kogut, Phys. Rep. C 23 (1976) 348.
 - [18] H. Fritzsch, M. Gell-Mann, H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. B 47 (1973) 365.
 - [19] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 31 (1973) 494.
 - [20] H. Georgi, S. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32 (1974) 438.
 - [21] J.L. Gervais, A. Neveu, Phys. Rep. C 23 (1976) 240.
 - [22] S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rev. D 20 (1979) 3223.
 - [23] S.G. Matinyan, G.K. Savvidy, Nucl. Phys. B 134 (1978) 539.
 - [24] V. Gogohia, Gy. Kluge, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 076008.
 - [25] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 147 (1979) 385, 448; V.A. Novikov, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 191 (1981) 301.
 - [26] I. Halperin, A. Zhitnitsky, Nucl. Phys. B 539 (1999) 166.
 - [27] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 156 (1979) 269; G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B 159 (1979) 213.
 - [28] V. Gogohia, Phys. Lett. B 501 (2001) 60; V. Gogohia, H. Toki, Phys. Rev. D 61 (2000) 036006; ibid. 63 (2001) 079901(E).
 - [29] M. Gell-Mann, R.J. Oakes, B. Renner, Phys. Rev. 175 (1968) 2195.

- [30] V. Gogokhia, hep-ph/0606010, hep-th/0604095.
- [31] V. Gogohia, hep-ph/0508224;
V. Gogohia, Gy. Kluge, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 076008.
- [32] V. Gogohia, Gy. Kluge, M. Prisznyak, hep-ph/9509427.
- [33] M.A. Lavrentiev, B.V. Shabat, Methods of the theory of functions of complex variable, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Nauka, 1987.
- [34] K.B. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 2445.
- [35] M. Bander, Phys. Rep. 75 (1981) 205.
- [36] A.I. Alekseev, B.A. Arbuzov, Phys. Atom. Nucl. 61 (1998) 264.
- [37] K.D. Born et al., Phys. Lett. B 329 (1994) 325;
V.M. Miller et al., Phys. Lett. B 335 (1994) 71.
- [38] V.N. Gribov, Gauge Theories and Quark Confinement (PHASIS, Moscow, 2002).
- [39] G. Preparata, Phys. Rev. D 7 (1973) 2973.
- [40] G. Pocsik, T. Torma, Acta Phys. Hun. 62 (1987) 101, 107;
Z. Fodor, Acta Phys. Pol. B 19 (1988) 21.
- [41] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 75 (1974) 461.
- [42] I.V. Andreev, QCD and hard processes at high energies, Russ. Ed., Moscow, Nauka, 1981.
- [43] F. Wilczek, Proc. Inter. Conf., QCD-20 Years Later, Aachen, June 9-13, 1992, v. 1.
- [44] D.V. Shirkov, hep-ph/0208082.
- [45] S. Coleman, E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D 7 (1973) 1888.
- [46] D.J. Gross, A. Neveu, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 3235.
- [47] J.S. Ball, T.-W. Chiu, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 2542, 2550.
- [48] G. Leibbrandt, Noncovariant Gauges (WS, Singapore, 1994).
- [49] A. Bassetto, G. Nardelli, R. Soldati, Yang-Mills Theories in Algebraic Non Covariant Gauges (WS, Singapore, 1991).
- [50] Y.L. Dokshitzer, D.E. Kharzeev, hep-ph/0404216.
- [51] E.R. Speer, Jour. Math. Phys. 15 (1974) 1.
- [52] N.N. Bogoliubov, D.V. Shirkov, Introduction to the Theory of Quantised Fields (Interscience Publisher, NY, 1959).